



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,916	02/12/2002	Robert H. Drake JR.	11-912	4237

7590 02/20/2004  
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/072,916

Applicant(s)

DRAKE, ROBERT H. *ob*

Examiner

Christopher C Pratt

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5.  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)  will not be entered or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a)  approved or b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argue that the term "exclusive" does not render the claim indefinite because it means that the nonwoven layer claimed is not part of the carpeting. Applicant argues that word exclusive limits the claimed carpeting to exclude the nonwoven layer of material in claim 1. However, the carpeting is directly adhered to the nonwoven layer so how can the two layers be exclusive? Applicant concedes these layer are adhered together but draws a distinction in that they are not "fused" together as part of the manufacturing process of a commercial carpet. The examiner fails to understand the distinction between "fused" and "adhered." Moreover, when these layer are combined, i.e. the manufacturing process as opposed to the installation process, is irrelevant to the instant rejection. The claims are evaluated based on the final product they produce.

Applicant argues that the prior art of the instant rejection is different from the instant invention because of the distinction created by the term "exclusive." However, the claim requires a flooring system comprising a nonwoven layer and a carpet layer. The prior art of the instant rejection teaches a flooring system comprising a nonwoven layer and carpet layer. It is the examiner's position that he prior art teaches the limitations of applicant's claims.



TERREL MORRIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700